

REMARKS

In the non-final Office action of January 15, 2004, claim 45 was rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,179,832. Applicant appreciates the indication in the Office action that claims 40-44 and 50 are allowed. Although the Office action only noted that claims 40-50 were pending in the application, this appears to have been a typographical error. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 40-51 were actually pending in the application, and that claim 51 should have been allowed as well.

By the present Amendment, new claims 52-56 have been added. Claims 40-56 remain pending and under consideration in the present application. Applicant has also attempted to provide correct parenthetical status identifiers for the pending claims in the present Amendment. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application.

To obviate the obviousness-type double patenting rejection, a terminal disclaimer in connection with U.S. Patent No. 6,179,832 is submitted herewith. Applicant respectfully requests that the obviousness-type double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

New claims 52-56 have been added to further describe the claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of the present application. Should any question arise, kindly contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LEE & UTECHT, LLP

By: _____

James Juo

Registration No. 36,177

Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201